The Truth About the CIA, P. 2, and Gen. Shoup on Vietnam, P. 3

A Word to the Unwise From America's Greatest Living Historian

"We do not have the resources, material, intellectual or moral to be at once an American power, a European power, and an Asian power. Justice Holmes used to say that the first lesson a Judge had to learn was that he was not God. It is a lesson every man has to learn and a lesson every nation has to learn . . . It is not our duty to keep peace throughout the globe, to put down aggression wherever it starts up, to stop the advance of communism or other isms which we may not approve of."
—Henry Steele Commager: Senate Foreign Relations *Feb. 20*

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XV, NO. 9 MARCH 6, 1967 101 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

The Mendacities Go Marching On, Truce or No Truce

The U.S. used the Tet truce in Vietnam to bring up supplies for the biggest ground operation of the war. This is the truth hidden from the American public, which is still being fed the myth that massive supply operations in North Vietnam gave Johnson no alternative but to resume his bombing. The brain-washing that afflicts most Americans was deliciously summed up by a cartoon in the *Montreal Star* (reprinted in the *Saturday Review,* Feb. 11). This showed two U.S. officers beside a huge battleship being loaded with troops while cranes swung tanks aboard overhead. One officer says to the other, "Just watch those Congs use the truce for a big buildup."

The Offensive We Prepared During Tet

In last week's issue we exposed the fraudulent campaign about a huge and illegal supply buildup in the North. No sooner had we gone to press than it was announced Feb. 23 that some 30,000 troops had launched "Junction City," a giant search-and-destroy operation against the Viet Cong Zone C in Tay Ninh Province, the biggest yet in this war. Readers will recall that last week we quoted an *Agence France Presse* dispatch from Saigon in *Le Monde* (Feb. 12-13) which described the "long files" of military trucks stretched out during the truce on the road from Saigon to Tay Ninh and the loads of shells for 105.mm and 155.mm cannons being hauled to American units on the edge of Zone C. When the offensive was unleashed from there the following week *AFP* in *Le Monde* (Feb. 25) reported that this offensive "had been prepared during the Tet truce." Not one word of this has appeared in the U.S. press. I managed to break through the Iron Curtain that shelters government propaganda here by making available advance proofs of last week's issue to *The Guardian* in London and Manchester which printed a resume of our story under a four-column headline on page one, Friday, Feb. 24. This produced so many queries from London that the Pentagon that day was forced to issue a denial, which appeared on the UPI wire but was printed only in London. We give it slightly abridged in a box on this page. It isn't much of a denial and it embodies a new falsehood.

The Pentagon denies that it ever charged that the North Vietnamese were violating the truce by their supply activities (all north of the 17th parallel so far as our own reconnaissance observed it) and that it never denied that we were using the truce for movement of supplies, too. Literally this may be so. But the White House, the State Department and the Pentagon certainly did their best, to create a contrary impression without explicitly stating a falsehood. Indeed its spokesmen continue to foster that false impression. Senator Russell repeated this myth when debate opened in the Senate Feb. 23 on the supplemental Vietnamese war appropriation. Arthur Goldberg in Tokyo went even further. Three days after the Pentagon issued its denial here, Goldberg was repeating the same myth in Tokyo (*New York Times,* Feb. 28) and adding a new embellishment: he claimed a violation not only of the truce but of the Geneva accord, though even our military did not claim that supplies had actually been spotted crossing the 17th parallel!

It is frustrating to feel so powerless as these myths go marching on. I feel as if I were being smothered under a blanket. The new falsehood in the Pentagon reply was in its smug assertion that all the truce meant to us was higher wages for longshoremen since we have air and naval supremacy "and have no need of a truce of any kind to move supplies." Let us put aside for a moment the Double-Think character of this remark, which implies that any time our bombing of the North stops it is somehow not cricket for people there to breathe freely and move around normally, while the cessation lasts. The hidden falsehood lies in the fact that while we do domi-

(Continued on Page Four)

The Pentagon's Reply to the Weekly

"Washington—The Defense Department commenting on charges in I. F. Stone's Weekly said the Department has never charged that the North Vietnamese had violated any truce arrangements by vastly increasing their movement of supplies [during the Tet truce]. Neither has it denied that U.S. forces continued their movement of supplies. All that it has done was to stress that the truce has been seized upon by the North Vietnamese as a golden opportunity to move, in the four days of the truce, as many supplies as they are normally able to move in a month because of the handicaps imposed by the bombings. 'All that the Tet truce meant to us logistically was that we had to pay holiday pay to the longshoremen who worked and that many civilian employes preferred to celebrate,' the spokesman said. 'The point that Mr. Stone is missing is that we have air and naval supremacy and have no need of a truce of any kind to move supplies.'"
—Abridged from the UPI ticker Feb. 24

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

With Our Paternal Salute to Michael Wood, and Complete Agreement on The CIA

Trying to Put the Student Who Spilled the Beans on the Griddle

FRANK REYNOLDS (ABC White House Correspondent): Once again there is a great hue and cry in this country and abroad about the Central Intelligence Agency. The story broke, of course, with the disclosure in *Ramparts* Magazine that the CIA had been subsidizing the National Student Association. With us today are three young men who have been involved in the affair. First, Michael Wood who was Director of Development for the NSA. Mr. Wood is the man who gave the story to *Ramparts*. Mr. Wood you are the man who started all *the fuss*. In that magazine you say that to break the story was the most agonizing decision of your life. Now I am sure, Mr. Wood, that you are aware there are a great many people who are not necessarily rightwing extremists or professional cold warriors who are disturbed by what these disclosures have meant to the CIA. Carl Rowan * in today's *Washington Star* writes:

The harsh truth is that these exposures have destroyed the CIA as an effective instrument in many arenas of the cold war that is still being waged furiously despite the recent talk about detente. So what the Communists spent billions unsuccessfully to do, we Americans out of idealism have delivered to them as a gift.

What do you say to that?

MICHAEL WOOD: If the U.S. is going to be engaged in a world struggle of ideas, I think we have to compete on our own terms which means that we have to be true to our own values, by using an open, democratic public society, as opposed to any sort of society that practices totalitarianim or restrictions on people's freedom. The argument that the Communists use the same sort of techniques doesn't wash, in my mind. If you accept their rules, you play their game, then you simply bow to their values.

Mr. REYNOLDS: Do you believe you have destroyed CIA as an effective instrument of the cold war?

Mr. WOOD: Unfortunately I think the CIA and the people who support the CIA are both more clever and more cynical than to be destroyed by this sort of operation. . . .

Mr. REYNOLDS: You don't expect anything worthwhile from your point of view from the Katzenbach investigation?

Mr. WOOD: Surely not. It strikes me that if there is a cancer in the society, you don't go to the cancer itself and ask it to perform surgery. . . .

Mr. REYNOLDS: In the report the Under Secretary filed to the President he mentioned that the CIA was not acting on its own initiative, but in accordance with policies established by the National Security Council and in effect under four Presidents. What you are really doing is setting your judgment against that of four Presidents.

Mr. WOOD: The great beauty of this country, as I was taught it, was that it is a country which in fact allows what you think is arrogant, that a citizen can advance an independent viewpoint with respect to public issues. *That it was approved at the highest level of government only indicates the extent to which the corruption that the CIA was involved in has spread.* I am sure that the requisitions for the gas chambers in Nazi Germany were approved at the higher level of government.

Mr. REYNOLDS: Quite apart from what is involved here in terms of morality and with respect to the secrecy, the position that seems to be developing is that of a very rich, generous and benign uncle. The CIA didn't seem to bother you too much.

Mr. WOOD: I think my analysis is a little more thoroughgoing. At the 18th Congress, two former alumni who were agents of the CIA were at the Congress and organized the moderate position on Vietnam They were concerned that certain elements not be in the Vietnam resolution. For example, no permanent cessation of bombing—this is in 1965—and a stipulation that the opposite side had to respond in kind to any gesture of the U.S. These people played a very active role.

Mr. REYNOLDS: Were there any pressures on you?

Mr. WOOD: There were immense pressures exerted on me. There were pressures placed on other people in attempts to get lawyers to drop cases, attempts to get lawyers to feed CIA lines to their clients, threats to forge psychiatric records. All of this out of the so-called enlightened wing of the CIA.

Mr. REYNOLDS: What is this about psychiatric threats?

Mr. WOOD: There was a threat against one individual to forge psychiatric records and place them in strategic spots in the government in order to discredit his character and to exclude him from a responsible role in the government. . . .

Mr. REYNOLDS: What would have happened to the NSA, gentlemen, in its overseas activities, had there not been a subsidy—let's forget for the moment that it came from the CIA—had you not been subsidized by the Federal government?

MR. RICHARD STEARNS (*Int'l Affairs V.P., NSA*): I doubt if NSA would have had an international program. . . .

Mr. REYNOLDS: In 1952 you think it might have been difficut, considering the mood of Congress, to get support for NSA?

Mr. STEARNS: Exactly. . . .

Mr. WOOD: The argument is a very elitist argument. The people of the U.S. are not intelligent enough; they are not well informed enough to make any sort of judgments with respect to foreign policy. Therefore you have to place it in the hands of certain elites. Therefore you have to make these decisions in a sub rosa organization which gets only very limited review by the Congress. Now that is the argument that CIA types use in trying to justify the subsidy: that the Congress wouldn't do it. Therefore you have to do it without the Congress' knowledge. Now that strikes me as being highly anti-democratic.

—Abridged from Issues and Answers ABC-TV Feb. 26

Last to Know Dept.

"Miami Beach, Fla., Feb. 24 (AP)—George Meany said today . . . he had no personal knowledge of any CIA money going to labor unions and . . . also said that Jay Lovestone, AFL-CIO international affairs director, was not involved in any way with the CIA."

—Baltimore Sun, *Feb. 25*

***As director of the U.S. Information Agency, Rowan put forward the doctrine of "the people's right not to know."—IFS**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Retired U.S. Marine Commandant Advises Youth To Get Out And Demonstrate

Southeast Asia Not Worth "The Life or Limb of A Single American"

Sen. Hartke (D. Ind), a critic of the Vietnamese war, put into the Congressional Record *Feb. 20 (at p. S2279) the text of an extraordinary speech made at the 10th annual Junior College World Affairs Day in Los Angeles last May by Gen. David M. Shoup, retired Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps from which we present these excerpts of his advice to American youth:*

Are you just going to reproduce excessively . . . or will you also sincerely and actively participate in what I believe to be man's most noble efforts on earth—first, his struggle to free mankind from the affluent who gorge on delicacies while children starve for the lack of milk and bread; and, second, his striving for peace on earth? . . .

You read, you're televised to, you're radioed to, you're preached to, that it is necessary that we have our armed forces fight, get killed and maimed, and kill and maim other human beings including women and children because now is the time we must stop some kind of unwanted ideology from creeping up on this nation. The place we choose to do this is 8,000 miles away with water in between.

The Excuses Are Shallow

The reasons fed to us are too shallow and narrow for students as well as other citizens. Especially when you realize that what is happening, no matter how carefully and slowly the military escalation has progressed, may be projecting us toward world catastrophe. Surely it is confusing.

Particularly is this true when we know that a great deal closer there are essentially the same situations:

(1) Since last July, Peru's national army has been battling red guerrillas in more than half its states.

(2) Red guerrillas run areas in several states of Colombia.

(3) Many businessmen are leaving Guatemala following ransom kidnappings by Communist bands. . . .

It must be a bit confusing, too, to read and hear about fighting for freedom. Supposedly we have it, and I don't think anyone is going to take it away from us by playing cops and robbers in Southeast Asia. Even so we urge others to fight for freedom. . . . The people we urge this upon in Southeast Asia, South America and many other places have no idea of our meaning of freedom. . . .

These masses of people have always lived where the few have everything. Everything that is produced by the burdensome labor of the many. And the many have nothing but the barest subsistence and not always that. . . .

I want to tell you, I don't think the whole of Southeast Asia, as related to the present and future safety and freedom of the people of this country, is worth the life or limb of a single American. . . .

I believe that if we had and would keep our dirty, bloody dollar-crooked fingers out of the business of these nations so full of depressed, exploited people, they will arrive at a solution of their own. That they design and want. That they fight and work for. And if unfortunately their revolution must be of the violent type because the 'haves' refuse to share with the 'have-nots' by any peaceful method, at least what they get will be their own and not the American style, which they don't want and above all don't want crammed down their throats by Americans.

Time and history have proved how wrong we were about Mexico in the second decade of the century. . . .

Until you're 21 you can't vote. . . . But you can make your voice heard. You don't have to be a vegetable 'til you're 21. Historically, demonstrations intended to bring unrealistic regimes to heel, have on balance produced good for the exploited masses. Brought to mind are Magna Charta, Joan of Arc, India, South American countries, China, the Buddhists in South Vietnam, and where would the Negro be today without the demonstrations of the recent past which awakened many sleeping American whites? It may well be that this technique has finally come in an exploding fashion to America and American students. It shows you are thinking.

Don't let yourself get too shook-up by the over-advertised encroachment of communism. Help people to get things and Communism will strangle by its own umbilical cord.

China Called Our Greatest Blunder

"From my experiences over parts of five years in China and what I know of conditions there today, I'm sure that more Chinese know where tomorrow's food is coming from than ever in the history of living man. To what must go the credit? The system they're serving under.

"The alienation of the friendship of the great and wonderful Chinese people will surely vie for centuries to come as the greatest blunder this country ever made in her relations with other nations, unless the final results from our Vietnam commitment overshadows it. You say what about the Republic of China vis a vis Red China? I reply, time is on the side of the one with the bigger hunk of earth. And that's not Taiwan."

—From the same Shoup speech excerpted on this page

We Risk Our National Substance If We Fail to See The Nature of War Has Changed

"The advent of nuclear war has brought about a fundamental change in the very nature of war itself. The Clausewitzian orthodoxy that war is a continuation of politics by other means, no longer applies. The concept that if you destroy enough people and property you overcome an enemy's will to resist is equally fallacious. A corollary to this is that a nation should use as much force as is necessary to win since there is no substitute for victory. Actually the nature of conflict being what it is and the danger of a nuclear holocaust being ever present, it is compelling that solutions less than total war be found . . . This change in the nature of war is quite fundamental and should be reflected in our policy. Otherwise we shall expend our national wealth and manpower in never-ending conflicts all over the world . . .

"A small part of what we have spent in Vietnam in the last 10 years if applied to our own problems would have improved tremendously the conditions in our own country while, at the same time, we would be in a much better position to help others. For we cannot live in an enclave of affluence in a world in which a third of its people is very poor, with a per capita gross national product of less than $100, and another third not much better off."

—Lt. Gen. Gavin to Senate Foreign Relations Feb. 21

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Blackout Here, But Questions Were Asked in the House of Commons

(Continued from Page One)

nate the air and the sea, we do not dominate the roads in South Vietnam. "Normally"—to use the word our military apply to the constant bombing of the north—we cannot move supplies on most of the roads in the South without a heavy investment of armor and troops.

How Tet Helped Us, Too

In the truce, supply was not a violation by either side. To fire upon a convoy (or an air strip) was a violation of the truce. It was therefore easier and less costly for us to move on the roads (and far less dangerous to land and drop supplies upcountry).* Tay Ninh has been an air supply area. It is much more costly and difficult to move heavy supplies by air, especially when small air strips ("normally" subject to enemy fire) limit landings to helicopters and the smaller cargo planes. To get from Saigon to Tay Ninh city on the edge of Zone C one goes about 45 miles northwest on Route 1 and then about 35 miles north on Route 22 to Tay Ninh. Few Americans are foolhardy enough to venture very far out of Saigon on Route 1 even by day without a military escort, and fewer still on Route 22, where peasant and commercial traffic —as our military admit—pay road fees to the Viet Cong. Helicopters and tanks protected the trucks which went up those roads during Tet, but they didn't have to fear the kind of traps, ambushes or blocks of "normal" times.

When Saturday's *Le Monde* (Feb. 25) reached me Sunday with its reference to the use of Tet by U.S. forces to prepare the "Junction City" operation, I called this to *The Guardian's* attention. It published this in London Monday morning. As a result there were questions from Laborite backbenchers in the Commons that day, notably by Sidney Silverman, James Davidson and Michael Foot. Foot asked the Foreign Minister whether the new offensive had not been made possible in part by resupply during the truce. But this and similar questions drew evasions rather than denials from the Foreign Minister George Brown. All this, too, was blacked out in the U.S. press. No one reported either the questions or the answers and it was only by telephoning London that I was able to learn about it in time for this issue. Here the initiation of naval shellfire, river mines and artillery barrages across the Parallel is accompanied by the usual escalation in mendacity. Mr. Johnson summoned an impromptu press conference to deny that these new moves constituted escalation at all. He said he wouldn't describe them as *any* kind of step-up because, as he said, "I wouldn't want to put my credibility in doubt." Nobody had the temerity to suggest this was a maidenhead he had lost a long time ago.

Iron Triangle Epilogue

"When the Army decided the Iron Triangle had to be obliterated, there were great expectations. The enemy would be bagged and their burrows blown to kingdom come. But it didn't quite work out that way. A relatively few enemy were either snared or killed. The tunnel systems were not destroyed but only damaged. The panorama is now scarred from end to end, not only by bomb craters but by ribbons of turned red soil where fleets of bulldozers did their work. Still it remains true that not one B-52 crater and none of this bustle and bang over the surface hit deep enough to damage even slightly any one of the tunnel systems, according to engineers who explored the tunnels. They found it impossible to destroy them. The best that could be done was to interrupt them here and there by blowing them up or saturating them with chemicals that might last a while longer. It is not simply that the tunnels are too far below the surface. But rather nowhere do they maintain a straight line. It is always zig-zag to thwart any weapon or chemical. Baffle doors and vents are numerous. The effect is to limit the area of destructiveness. Furthermore the evidence shows that before our combat troops had completed withdrawing from the triangle, the Viet Cong were moving back in."

—Gen. S. L. A. Marshall from Bien Hoa, Vietnam, in the New York World Journal Tribune *Sunday, Feb. 26.*

* This may explain the sharp increase in air cargo during Tet which we also reported last week.

We'll Send Free Copies of This and the Previous Two Issues on the Truce to Your Friends If You Send Stamped Addressed LONG Envelopes—Help Us Get Out the Truth in This Way

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington, D. C. 20015

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

3/6/67

For the enclosed $5 send a gift sub to:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

For $5.35 extra send I. F. Stone's *The Haunted Fifties*

Indicate if announcement wished ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except in August, the last week in December and the first week in January and Bi-Weekly during July at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; 20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED